arXiv:cond-mat/9309013v1 13 Sep 1993

Pair description of the FQHE with application to edge waves

M. Marsili

International School for Advanced Studies (SISSA)

V.Beirut 2-4, 34014 Trieste, Italy

Abstract

Pairs of particles of definite total and relative angular momentum provide a natural description for a two dimensional electron gas in a strong magnetic field. Two body operators take a simple form when expressed in terms of pair creation and destruction operators. The pair formalism is applied to the study of edge waves excitations. For $\nu = 1$ the operators which create edge excitations are identified and the role the interaction potential plays in the long wavelength limit is clarified. This picture is claimed to describe also edge excitations on the $\nu = 1/m$ Laughlin states.

PACS. numbers 71.28, 71.10, 73.40

Typeset using REVTEX

I. INTRODUCTION

Contrary to the integer quantum Hall effect, which can be accounted for by a single particle description, the fractional effect arises as a result of condensation into a macroscopic collective ground state[1]. Much of the present understanding of the fractional quantum Hall effect (FQHE) is based on first quantized many electrons wave functions[2,3]. The strategy based on trial "variational" wave functions has the advantage of displaying in a very direct way the many body correlations between electrons. These correlations are induced by the pair potential acting on the electrons and this naturally leads to consider pair of electrons as the relevant degrees of freedom. Indeed the notion of particle pairs has been used by many authors[3–7] in the study of the FQH effect. No systematic description of the system in terms of pairs and no detailed analysis of the the distribution of their angular momenta has been given up to now. The first part of this work is an attempt in this direction. In the symmetric gauge pair creation and annihilation operators are introduced in a second quantized formalism; their quantum numbers are the total angular momentum (TAM) and the relative angular momentum (RAM). All relevant two body operators in the lowest Landau level (LLL) are simply related to the distribution of pairs' TAM and RAM. In spite of the simple expression of the operators, the complex commutation relations among pairs, which deviate from perfect boson character, preclude a simple description of the Hilbert space. The first section is devoted to the derivation of the basic formulas, to the discussion of some simple examples and to a brief review of some well known results, easily recovered within the pair description.

The second part deals with an application to a specific problem for which an interesting picture has been recently proposed on the basis of both analytical and numerical work[8]. This concerns the low lying excitations near incompressible states as the $\nu = 1$ or $\nu = 1/3$ states usually called edge waves. The pair picture provides a simple description of edge excitations. The main result is an operator relation that, under some conditions for the incompressible ground state, allows to identify the creation operators of edge excitations. The case $\nu = 1$, for which these conditions are satisfied, is treated in detail also relying on a

Hartree approximation. The same picture is suggested to hold also for the $\nu = 1/m$ Laughlin states. The role the e$^-$- e$^-$ interaction plays in the edge wave dispersion relation is also clarified. In particular the results confirm the validity of the semiclassical approximation[9] for edge states and suggest that the dispersion relation is asymptotically linear. Moreover it is shown that the contribution to the velocity of edge waves vanishes, in the thermodynamic limit, for any potential that decays faster than $1/r$ as $r \to \infty$.

II. PAIR DESCRIPTION OF THE FQHE IN THE SYMMETRIC GAUGE

The Hilbert space of two dimensional charged particles in the x-y plane is split into Landau levels by a magnetic field $\vec{B} = B_z \hat{z}$. In the extreme quantum limit ($B_z \to \infty$) all the particles are confined in the lowest level. The kinetic energy, reduced to the zero point motion, is an inessential constant so that the hamiltonian of the system contains only potential terms. Among these the dominant role is played by the particle-particle interaction potential. With this general motivation in mind we will concentrate in this section on the projection of two body operators on the LLL.

Let us consider a general two body operator represented, in first quantization, by the function $\mathcal{V}(z_1, z_2)$ ($z_j = x_j + iy_j$ is the complex coordinate for particle j on the complex plane). Magnetic units, $\ell = \sqrt{\hbar c/eH} = 1$, will be used throughout. The second quantized form of this operator in the LLL, in the symmetric gauge, is:

$$\hat{V} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{T=1}^{\infty} \sum_{u,s=0}^{T} \langle T-u, u|\mathcal{V}|T-s, s\rangle c^{+}_{T-u} c^{+}_{u} c_s c_{T-s} \tag{1}$$

The operator c^{+}_{u} creates one electron in the LLL orbital $\phi_u(z) = (2\pi 2^u u!)^{-1/2}\, z^u e^{-|z|^2/4}$ and c_u is its hermitian conjugate. The conservation of TAM is explicit in equation (1) and the matrix element is given by:

$$\langle T-u, u|\mathcal{V}|T-s, s\rangle = \frac{I_V(T,s,u)}{4\pi^2 2^T \sqrt{(T-s)!s!(T-u)!u!}} \tag{2}$$

with $I_V(T,s,u) = \int d^2z_1 d^2z_2\, \bar{z}_1{}^{T-u} \bar{z}_2{}^{u} \mathcal{V}(z_1,z_2) z_1^{T-s} z_2^{s} e^{-(|z_1|^2+|z_2|^2)/2}$. We consider in what follows only operators $\mathcal{V}(z_1, z_2)$ that are separable in the relative ($\xi = (z_1 - z_2)/2$) and center of mass ($Z = (z_1 + z_2)/2$) coordinates: $\mathcal{V}(Z + \xi, Z - \xi) = w(Z) \cdot v(\xi)$ In this case the integral in the matrix element can be performed[10] as follows:

$$I_V(T,s,u) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{T-s} \sum_{\beta=0}^{s} \sum_{\gamma=0}^{T-u} \sum_{\sigma=0}^{u} \binom{T-s}{\alpha} \binom{s}{\beta} \binom{T-u}{\gamma} \binom{u}{\sigma} (-1)^{\beta+\sigma} \cdot$$
$$\cdot \int d^2Z \, \bar{Z}^{T-\gamma-\sigma} w(Z) Z^{T-\alpha-\beta} e^{-|Z|^2} \cdot 2 \int d^2\xi \, bar\xi^{\gamma+\sigma} v(\xi) \xi^{\alpha+\beta} e^{-|\xi|^2}.$$

The integrals vanish whenever $\alpha + \beta \neq \gamma + \sigma$. Using a differential representation of the discrete delta function $\delta_{i,j} = \partial_x^i x^j / i!|_{x=0}$ and introducing the integer variable $q = \alpha + \beta = \gamma + \sigma$ the sums on α, β, γ and σ can be carried out and

$$I_V(T,s,u) = \sum_{q=0}^{T} \frac{\partial_x^q}{q!} (1+x)^{T-u} (1-x)^u \bigg|_{x=0} \frac{\partial_y^q}{q!} (1+y)^{T-s} (1-y)^s \bigg|_{y=0} I_\xi(q) I_Z(T,q)$$
$$\text{with} \quad I_\xi(q) = 2 \int d^2\xi \, v(\xi) |\xi|^{2q} e^{-|\xi|^2}, \;\; I_Z(T,q) = \int d^2Z \, w(Z) |Z|^{2(T-q)} e^{-|Z|^2}$$

It is now possible to sum independently on u and s in equation (1), so that the second quantized form of the operator $\hat{V}$ becomes:

$$\hat{V} = \sum_{T=1}^{\infty} \sum_{q=0}^{T} V_T(q) f_T^+(q) f_T(q). \tag{3}$$

The sum on u in equation (1), which involves the first integral and the pair of operators $c_{T-u}^+ c_u^+$, defines the pair creation operator

$$f_T^+(q) = \sum_{u=0}^{T} b_T(u,q) c_{T-u}^+ c_u^+ \tag{4}$$

Similarly the sum on s yields the hermitian conjugate $f_T(q)$. Requiring normalization of the state $f_T^+(q)|0\rangle$, some elementary algebra yields:

$$b_T(u,q) = \sqrt{\frac{\binom{T}{u}}{\binom{T}{q} 2^{T+1}}} \left[\frac{\partial_z^q}{q!} (1+z)^{T-u} (1-z)^u \right]_{z=0} \tag{5}$$

and

$$V_T(q) = \frac{I_Z(T,q) \cdot I_\xi(q)}{2\pi^2 (T-q)! q!} \tag{6}$$

An orthogonality relation can be easily derived from equation (5):

$$2\sum_{u=0}^{T} b_T(u,q) b_T(u,p) = \delta_{q,p} \tag{7}$$

since $b_T(u,q) = b_T(q,u)$ an analogous relation holds for sums on q. This relation is of frequent use when q runs only on even (odd) values. In this case the sum can be extended to all q by inserting $(1 \pm (-1)^q)/2$ in the sum. This yields

$$4\sum_{q} b_T(u,q) b_T(s,q) = \delta_{u,s} \pm \delta_{u,T-s} \tag{8}$$

the upper (lower) sign refers to even (odd) q.

In the limit $T \to \infty$ the coefficients $b_T(u,q)$ are simply related to Hermite orthonormal functions $\phi_q(x) = \pi^{-1/4}(q!2^q)^{-1/2} H_q(x) e^{-x^2/2}$ ($H_q(x)$ are Hermite polynomials):

$$b_T\left(\sqrt{2/T}x + \sqrt{T/2}, q\right) = (2T)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \left[\phi_q(x) + O\left(\frac{q}{T}\right)\right]. \tag{9}$$

Note that $b_T(T-u,q) = (-1)^q b_T(u,q)$ so that, using the commutation relations of the operators c_u and c_u^+, we realize that for fermions $f_T(q) \equiv 0$ for q even. Similarly, as a consequence of statistics, only even values of q occur if bose particles are concerned. This is confirmed by the symmetry of the first quantized wave function $\psi_{T,q}(Z,\xi)$ of the pair (T,q) under the exchange $\xi \to -\xi$:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{T,q}(Z,\xi) &= \sqrt{2}\sum_{u=0}^{T} b_T(u,q)\phi_u(Z+\xi)\phi_{T-u}(Z-\xi) = \\ &= \frac{Z^{T-q}\xi^q}{2\pi\sqrt{(T-q)!q!}} e^{-|Z|^2/2-|\xi|^2/2} \end{aligned}$$

This equation explicitly shows that the pair quantum numbers q and T represent the RAM and the TAM of the pair respectively. In a classical picture the pair's center of mass revolves round the center of the disk at a radius $\sqrt{\langle Z^2\rangle} = \sqrt{T-q+1}$ while the two particles rotate around the center of mass Z on a circumference of radius $\sqrt{\langle \xi^2\rangle} = \sqrt{q+1}$. The average distance from the center of the disk of one of the two electrons is $\sqrt{\langle Z^2 + \xi^2\rangle} = \sqrt{T+2}$. This consideration is useful to identify the degrees of freedom relevant for the behaviour of the system in the bulk an at the boundary. A generalization to higher Landau levels of the expansion in pair wave functions in RAM and TAM was used by A.H.MacDonald et al.[7].

Let us now turn to the discussion of equation (6). In the case $w(Z) = 1$, $I_Z(T, q) = \pi(T - q)!$ and $V_T(q) = \epsilon_q$ is independent of T so that:

$$\epsilon_q = \frac{I_\xi(q)}{2\pi q!} = \int_0^\infty v\left(\sqrt{x}\right) \frac{x^q}{q!} e^{-x} dx \tag{10}$$

Note in particular that $\epsilon_q \sim v\left(\sqrt{q}\right)$ for $q \to \infty$. The decomposition of pair operators in components of different RAM has already been introduced by Haldane[5] for the spherical geometry. In the disk geometry the same decomposition was studied by Trugman and Kivelson[6] where a short range pair potential was expanded in powers of its range. An inversion formula for $v(\xi)$ as a function of ϵ_q is obtained by multiplying equation (10) by $(-1)^q \binom{n}{q}$ and summing over q:

$$v(r) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left[2 \sum_{q=0}^{n} (-1)^q \binom{n}{q} \epsilon_q \right] L_n(r^2). \tag{11}$$

where $L_n(x)$ is the normalized Laguerre polynomial of order n.

Examples of two body operators which can be expressed in the form (3) are:

i) the Coulomb interaction $\mathcal{V}(z_1, z_2) = 1/|z_1 - z_2|$:

$$V_T(q) = \epsilon_q^c = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \frac{(2q)!}{(q!2^q)^2} \tag{12}$$

note that for $q \gg 1$ $\epsilon_q \propto 1/\sqrt{q}$ as in the classical case.

ii) The hard core (HC) potential $\mathcal{V}(z_1, z_2) = 2\pi\nabla^2\delta(z_1 - z_2)$:

$$V_T(q) = \epsilon_q^h = \delta_{q,1}.$$

iii) The pair correlation function $g(r)$ corresponds to $\mathcal{V}(z_1, z_2) = \delta(r - z_1 + z_2)$:

$$V_T(q) = g_q(r) = \frac{r^{2q}}{q!4^q} e^{-r^2/4}. \tag{13}$$

Once the number of pairs with a definite RAM and TAM $N_T(q) = \langle f_T^+(q) f_T(q) \rangle$ is known on a given state for all T and q we are in a position to evaluate all relevant quantities.

The operators $f_T^+(q)$ do not represent true bosonic particles. In fact the commutation rules for $f_T^+(q)$ has a residual term which contains a density excitation:

$$\begin{aligned}\left[f_T(q), f_R^+(p)\right] &= \delta_{T,R}\delta_{q,p} - \\ &- 4\sum_u b_T(u,q) b_R(u,p) c_{R-u}^+ c_{T-u}\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The occurrence of such weird commutation relations makes the description of the Hilbert space in terms of pairs problematic. While only $n/2$ pairs are necessary to build a state, this contains much more pairs. Indeed it is easy to check that

$$\sum_{T=1}^{\infty}\sum_q \hat{N}_T(q) = \sum_{T=1}^{\infty}\sum_{u=0}^{T} c_u^+ c_u c_{T-u}^+ c_{T-u} = \frac{1}{2}n(n-1). \tag{15}$$

This trivial sum rule simply states that $n(n-1)/2$ pairs can be made out of n particles.

As an example of the pair's momentum distribution function it is easy to check that for the $\nu = 1$ state (all orbitals occupied up to $n-1$) all pair states are occupied for $T < n$, i.e. $N_T(q) = 1\ \forall q$, while

$$N_T(q) = 2\sum_{u=T-n+1}^{n-1} b_T^2(u,q) \quad \text{for } T \geq n \tag{16}$$

Figure 1 shows the distribution of RAM $N(q) = \sum_T N_T(q)$ for $\nu = 1/3$ and 6 electrons. Full dots refers to the true ground state of the Coulomb interaction while open squares to the state made of three pair creation operators with $T = q = 15$ acting on the vacuum. The latter state contains a lot of pairs with small RAM, including angular momentum one. The true ground state is instead characterized by a minimal number of pairs with the smallest value of q, since these give the largest contribution to the repulsive energy. In particular the Laughlin state (open dots) does not contain any pair with $q = 1$ so that it is the exact ground state for the HC interaction[10,6]. The dependence of $N(q)$ on q has been analyzed numerically for system of $n \leq 8$ electrons. A fairly good scaling of the form $N(q) = A_q n - B_q$ has been observed with $A_3 = 0.7965$, $A_5 = 0.5856$, $A_7 = 0.4659$ and $B_q \simeq 1$ for all q.

Equation (13) expresses a connection between the coefficients of different powers of r in $g(r)$ and the number of pairs with a definite RAM. These coefficients have been studied extensively by Yoshioka[11], in rectangular geometry (Landau gauge), who has found that the coefficient of r^2 and of r^4 (which is non zero in this gauge) decreases by decreasing ν and vanishes for $\nu \geq 1/3$. The same happens to the coefficient of r^6 and r^8 for $\nu \simeq 1/5$. A similar result was derived by Trugman and Kivelson[6] in the symmetric gauge. In the pair language the quantization in the FQHE occurs as a consequence of the successive elimination of all the pairs with the smallest RAM.

III. EDGE WAVES IN THE QUANTUM HALL EFFECT

We consider, in this section, the spectrum of low lying excitations on incompressible quantum Hall states in disk geometry. These excitations have been called edge waves (EW) because they involve density fluctuations of the two dimensional electron gas at the boundary of the system. A review on the subject can be found in a recent paper of X.G.Wen[9] where a general theory for edge excitations is discussed. The starting point of Wen's theory is a classical hydrodynamical approach where coordinates and canonical momenta yield, upon quantization, the creation operators of the edge modes. The outcome of this approach is a free phonon theory. This is obvious if only the one body confining potential, coming from electron-background interaction, is considered. This picture however holds even in the presence of the e^-- e^- interaction. A strong evidence of this has been given by M.Stone et al.[8] which have analyzed the energy spectrum due to the pair interaction using exact diagonalization for systems of up to 400 particles near $\nu = 1$. The ground state $|\psi_0(n)\rangle$ for $\nu = 1$ and n electrons is in first quantization (apart from the gaussian factors) the Vandermonde determinant $\Psi_o(z_1, \ldots, z_n) = \prod_{i<j}(z_i - z_j)$ whose total angular momentum is $L_o = \frac{1}{2}n(n-1)$. In the sector of total angular momentum $L = L_o + M$ the energy spectrum reduces, with excellent accuracy[8], to

$$E = E_o - \sum_k n_k \Omega_k \tag{17}$$

where n_k are (integer) bosonic occupation numbers such that $\sum_k n_k k = M$ and $\Omega_k \geq 0$ are *single particle* energies. Note that, since only the interaction potential is considered, the contribution to the EW spectrum is negative as a consequence of a loss of repulsive energy. If strictly only the LLL orbitals are considered, the Hilbert space of the system with $L = L_o + M$ is spanned, in first quantization, by the wave functions obtained by multiplying Ψ_o by symmetric polynomials of degree M. These in turn can be expressed in a unique way[12] as polynomials of *power sums* $\mathcal{S}_k(z_1, \ldots, z_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n z_i^k$. In their work M.Stone et al. conjecture that these polynomials correspond to the bosonic creation operators of edge modes.

In this section the problem is reformulated in the language of second quantization and the second quantized counterpart of $\mathcal{S}_k$ are shown to describe edge excitations as free bosons in the limit $n \to \infty$. Next the dispersion relation due to the interaction potential is discussed also relying on a Hartree approximation. We shall, as in the work of Stone et al., assume no confining potential so that the Hamiltonian consists only of the e^-- e^- interaction energy. The competition between the confining potential and the pair interaction in the EW spectrum is discussed elsewhere[13]. While bulk excitation involve the small q part $N_T(q)$ we expect that edge excitations depend on the large T behaviour of this distribution, since electrons on the edge of the quantum dot belong to pairs with $T \sim 2n$. On the scale of the total angular momentum $L = L_o + M$, a simple hydrodynamical argument[9] shows that edge excitations involve changes $\Delta L = M \sim \sqrt{n}$ (contrary to quasi particle excitations for which $\Delta L = M \sim n$). In the thermodynamic limit typical values of M and k are of the order $\sqrt{n}$. Note also that the size of the Hilbert space depends only on M as long as $M < n$.

$\mathcal{S}_k$ is, in second quantized form, the single particle ladder operator

$$S_k^+ = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{(m+k)!}{m!}} c_{m+k}^+ c_m \tag{18}$$

The conjugate operators S_k^- are easily defined. In general these do not satisfy commutation relations typical of bosonic creation and destruction operators. However M.Stone[12] showed, using polynomial algebra, that, in the limit $n \to \infty$ and for $\nu \simeq 1$, they do form a bosonic set of creation operators in the sense that the overlap between states with different occupation numbers (i.e. with different combinations of S_k^+) vanishes. The same can be shown to hold in the framework of second quantization for the operators S_k^+. If $|k\rangle = A_k(n)S_k^+|\psi_0(n)\rangle$ and $|k,j\rangle = A_{k,j}(n)S_k^+S_j^+|\psi_0(n)\rangle$ are normalized states, a straightforward calculation shows that $A_k(n) \propto n^{-k/2}$ and $\langle k,j|k+j\rangle \propto n^{-1}$. The general m *bosons* state, in the sector $L = L_o + M$, is

$$|k_1, \ldots, k_m\rangle = A_{k_1,\ldots,k_m}(n)S_{k_1}^+, \ldots, S_{k_m}^+|\psi_0(n)\rangle \tag{19}$$

where $\sum_i k_i = M$ and $A_{k_1,\ldots,k_m}(n) \propto n^{-M/2}$. The overlap between states with different occupation numbers vanishes at least as n^{-1}. The state $|\psi_0(n)\rangle$ is the vacuum state for the *bosons* created by S_k^+ since it is annihilated by S_k^- for any k.

If these were free bosons we would have $\left[\hat{H}, S_k^+\right] = -\Omega_k S_k^+$. This commutator, if the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ has the form (3), can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}\left[\hat{H}, S_k^+\right] = \sum_{T=1}^{\infty}\sum_q \Big\{ & V_{T+k}(q) f_{T+k}^+(q)\left[f_{T+k}(q), S_k^+\right] + \\ & + V_T(q)\left[f_T^+(q), S_k^+\right] f_T(q)\Big\}\end{aligned}$$

If $C_{k,l}(T,q)$ is defined such that

$$\left[f_{T+k}(q), S_k^+\right] = \sum_l C_{k,l}(T,q) f_T(q-l). \tag{20}$$

then[14] $\left[f_T^+(q), S_k^+\right] = -\sum_l C_{k,l}(T,q) f_{T+k}^+(q+l)$. The coefficients $C_{k,l}(T,q)$ are easily evaluated with the help of equation (7):

$$C_{k,l}(T,q) = 4\sum_{u=0}^{T} b_T(u,q)\sqrt{\frac{(u+k)!}{u!}}\, b_{T+k}(u+k, q+l) = 2(-1)^l \binom{k}{l}\sqrt{\frac{(T+k-q-l)!(q+l)!}{2^k (T-q)!q!}} \tag{21}$$

clearly $l \leq k$ otherwise $C_{k,l}(T,q) \equiv 0$. Since only even values of l occur, we will neglect factors $(-1)^l$ and implicitly assume, from now on, that $\sum_l$ runs only on even values. The final outcome reads:

$$\left[\hat{H}, S_k^+\right] = \sum_{T,q,l} C_{k,l}(T,q)\left[V_{T+k}(q+l) - V_T(q)\right] f_{T+k}^+(q+l) f_T(q) \tag{22}$$

that is: S_k^+ promotes a pair in the state (T,q) to states of larger TAM and RAM $(T+k,q+l)$. $C_{k,l}(T,q)$ describes how k additional units of angular momentum are distributed among the relative and the center of mass motion of the pair $f^+_{T+k}(q+l)$. The energy, for any such transition, changes by an amount $V_{T+k}(q+l)-V_T(q)$. Since $C_{k=1,l}(T,q)\propto\delta_{l,0}$, if $V_T(q)=\epsilon_q$ does not depend on T, we find $\left[\hat{H},S_1^+\right]\equiv 0$. This is a known result[6,8,10]: S_1^+ create zero energy excitations because these concern translations of the center of mass. Another consequence of equation (22) is that in the case of the HC potential the commutator turns out to be proportional to $f^+_{T+k}(1+l)f_T(1)$ so that it annihilates the ground state for $\nu\le 1/3$ thus yielding $\Omega_k\equiv 0$ for all k. Note finally that the EW spectrum is unaffected by a constant shift of the pair potential $V_T(q)\to V_0+V_T(q)$.

The operator form of equation (22) strongly resembles the action of a ladder operator in the relative and center of mass coordinates. Indeed the same procedure of section I leads, for the first quantized operator $\mathcal{A}_{k,l}(z_1,z_2)=Z^{k-l}\xi^l$, to the following expression:

$$A^+_{k,l}=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{T,q}\sqrt{\frac{(T+k-q-l)!(q+l)!}{(T-q)!q!}}f^+_{T+k}(q+l)f_T(q)$$

This is easily expressed in S_k^+ operators by expanding $Z^{k-l}\xi^l$ in the individual particle coordinates z_1 and z_2. The second quantization procedure applied to the resulting expression reads

$$\begin{aligned}A^+_{k,l}=2^{-\frac{k}{2}}\sum_{g=0}^{k}\left[\frac{\partial_x^g}{g!}(1+x)^{k-l}(1-x)^l\right]_{x=0}S^+_{k-g}S^+_g+\\ -\,2^{1+\frac{k}{2}}\delta_{l,0}S_k^+.\end{aligned}\tag{23}$$

Equation (22) can be expressed in terms of operators $A^+_{k,l}$ provided that $V_{T+k}(q+l)-V_T(q)$ is independent of T and q. Actually this is only fulfilled by $V_T(q)=-\gamma q$ which corresponds, in real space (see eq.(11)), to an harmonic potential $v(r)=2\gamma(1-r^2)$ in the inter-particle distance r. This potential has been studied[15,16] in first quantization and is a rather unphysical pair interaction being unbounded from below as $r\to\infty$. It has been pointed out recently[16] that this harmonic interaction leads to the disappearance of the FQHE. In the present context the stability of the FQH ground state, that depends on the competition between the pair interaction and the confining potential, is assumed. Given the harmonic potential $\epsilon_q = -\gamma q$, equation (22) is readily translated into

$$\left[\hat{H}, S_k^+\right] = -2^{2-\frac{k}{2}}\gamma \sum_l l \binom{k}{l} A_{k,l}^+ =$$

$$= -2\gamma \sum_{g=0}^{k} \binom{k}{g}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ 4 \sum_l l \sqrt{\binom{k}{l} 2^{-k-1}} b_k(l,g) \right\} S_{k-g}^+ S_g^+$$

here the sum on l runs only on even values. The second term of (23) does not contribute (this is true whenever $V_T(q) = \epsilon_q$). Since $2l\sqrt{\binom{k}{l}2^{-k-1}} = kb_k(l,0) + \sqrt{k}b_k(l,1)$, using (8) the sum in braces gives $k(\delta_{g,0} + \delta_{g,k}) - \sqrt{k}(\delta_{g,1} + \delta_{g,k-1})$ and finally

$$\left[\hat{H}, S_k^+\right] = -2\gamma k \left(nS_k^+ - S_1^+ S_{k-1}^+\right) \tag{24}$$

Note that this is an exact result ($S_0^+ \equiv n$). When evaluating the Hamiltonian for $L = L_o + M$ using the basis set (19) the first term will contribute to diagonal elements while the second to off-diagonal ones. The larger off diagonal element is the one between states $|\ldots, k, \ldots\rangle$ and $|\ldots, k-1, 1, \ldots\rangle$. The magnitude of the latter will be of order n^{-1} with respect to diagonal elements because of the explicit factor of n in equation (24). Other off diagonal elements, being proportional to the overlap of states with different occupation numbers, will be at least of order n^{-2} with respect to diagonal elements.

In the language of standard perturbation theory the first term of equation (24) may be regarded as coming from the unperturbed hamiltonian H_o, the second from a perturbation λV. The validity of perturbation theory depends on the ratio between λ and the separation ΔE between unperturbed eigen-energies (diagonal elements). Equation (24) immediately yields $\lambda/\Delta E \simeq k/n$. First order perturbation theory is then exact as $n \rightarrow \infty$ even for physical wave vectors for which $k \propto \sqrt{n}$: S_k^+ create free edge excitations with $\Omega_k = 2n\gamma k$. The generalization to more physical pair potentials insists on this same argument. Before turning to the general case it is useful to remark that for $k = 1$ the correct result $\Omega_{k=1} = 0$ is recovered and that the resulting EW dispersion is linear. The spectrum is then degenerate since $\Omega_{k+m} = \Omega_k + \Omega_m$. If $\gamma > 0$ the boson energy is an increasing function of k. In general if $\epsilon_q > 0$ is monotonically decreasing Ω_k is monotonically increasing in k.

An approximation scheme has to be introduced at this point to deal with more physical interaction potentials. The approximation essentially consists in taking out of the sum on T and q an effective value $\gamma_{k,l}(n)$ of $V_T(q) - V_{T+k}(q+l)$. The T dependence of $V_T(q)$, together with the second term of equation (23), will be dropped from now on. In practice the effective value of $\gamma_{k,l}(n)$ may be evaluated by evaluating the l^{th} term of equation (22) on the ground state:

$$\gamma_{k,l}(n) = \frac{1}{Z_{k,l}} \langle k| \sum_{T,q} C_{k,l}(T,q)(\epsilon_q - \epsilon_{q+l}) f^+_{T+k}(q+l) f_T(q) |\psi_0(n)\rangle = \sum_q P_{k,l}(q,n)(\epsilon_q - \epsilon_{q+l}) \tag{25}$$

where $Z_{k,l}$ is such that $\sum_q P_{k,l}(q,n) = 1$. The evaluation of $P_{k,l}(q,n)$ is a tedious task of algebra that is omitted here since it leads to a complex and lengthy expression from which it is hard to extract the interesting properties[17].

With this approximation equation (22) can be expanded in $A^+_{k,l}$ operators and finally in S^+_g operators

$$\left[\hat{H}, S^+_k\right] = -2 \sum_l \binom{k}{l} \gamma_{k,l}(n) A^+_{k,l} = \frac{-1}{2n} \sum_{g=0}^{k} \Omega_{k,g}(n) S^+_{k-g} S^+_g \tag{26}$$

$$\text{where} \qquad \Omega_{k,g}(n) = 4n \sum_l \binom{k}{l} \frac{\gamma_{k,l}(n)}{2^k} \left[\frac{\partial_x^g}{g!} (1+x)^{k-l} (1-x)^l \right]_{x=0} . \tag{27}$$

The same considerations following equation (24) show that only the $g = 0, k$ terms are dominant as $n \to \infty$. Moreover in this limit also the approximation $\epsilon_q - \epsilon_{q+l} \simeq \gamma_{k,l}(n)$ becomes exact for smooth monotonic potentials. Here smooth means that $\epsilon_q - \epsilon_{q+l}$ introduces a negligible dependence on q compared to the dependence of $C_{k,l}(T,q)$ on the same variable. If the scale of q values is proportional to n this condition is satisfied by very general potentials. The latter condition is verified if $P_{k,l}(q,n)$ depends on q only through the ratio q/n:

$$P_{k,l}(q,n) = \frac{1}{n} \mu_{k,l}(q/n) \tag{28}$$

The reason for this is that the dependence on n comes into $P_{k,l}(q,n)$ through the pair distribution functions $N_T(q)$ which has this property. Also one can argue that the typical value of q for a pair of electrons on the edge of the sample is of order n since the inter-pair distance, $\sqrt{q}$, should be of the order of the disk radius $R(n) \sim \sqrt{n}$. Equation (28) has been verified numerically. Figure 2 shows a very good collapse of $nP_{k,l}(xn,n)$ for $n = 30, 40$ and $k = 8$, $l = 2, 4, 6, 8$.

The condition on monotonicity is relevant because otherwise $\epsilon_{q+l} - \epsilon_q$ would change sign for some q. The operator structure of $\left[\hat{H}, S_k^+\right]$ could in this case be different from that of $S_{k-g}^+ S_g^+$. Another source of troubles if ϵ_q is not monotonic is that the sign of $\gamma_{k,l}(n)$ may change for different l and this may eventually cause cancellation in the $g = 0, k$ term. Instead, for monotonic potentials $\epsilon_{q+l} - \epsilon_q$, and thus $\gamma_{k,l}(n)$, has always the same sign, so that the $g = 0$ and $g = k$ terms in (27) are always at least of the same order of magnitude of the other ones. For example table I lists the overlap between the state $\langle k|$ and the ground state in the sector $L = L_o + k$ and $n = 30$, for the Coulomb, the HC potential and for the potential $\epsilon_q^x = q/(q^2 + 16)$. The latter is not monotonic and has a maximum at $q = 4$. We see that in the former cases the overlap is very close to unity, while for ϵ_q^x this is not true for $k > 5$. At $k = 6$ the state $\langle k|$ is between the ground state and the first excited state while for $k = 7$ it is very close to the second excited state. Another evidence of the correctness of the approximation is that the overlap depends weakly on the potential.

We can safely conclude that S_k^+ are the creation operators of the edge modes

$$\left[\hat{H}, S_k^+\right] = -\Omega_{k,0}(n) S_k^+ \quad \text{as } n \to \infty$$

where $\Omega_{k,0} = \Omega_{k,k}$ is given by (27). In the case $k \gg 1$, a rough estimate of $\Omega_{k,0}(n)$ is obtained observing that in (27) for $g = 0, k$ a binomial average is performed of $\gamma_{k,l}(n)$ and then $\Omega_{k,0} \simeq 2n\gamma_{k,k/2}(n)$.

Let us analyze in more detail the EW spectrum resulting from a general potential. Of particular interest is the behaviour of $\Omega_{k,0}(n)$ for a fixed k as $n \to \infty$. This is related to the behaviour of the dispersion relation of EW in the long wavelength limit. In fact the physical wave vector κ is proportional[9] to $k/\sqrt{n}$. The hydrodynamical picture[9] assumes a dispersion relation linear in κ for $\kappa \to 0$. The velocity c of EW is given by

$$c = \lim_{\kappa \to 0} \frac{\Omega_{\kappa\sqrt{n},0}}{\kappa} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\sqrt{n}\,\Omega_{k,0}(n)}{k} \tag{29}$$

As long as the potential ϵ_q is monotonic, $\gamma_{k,l}(n)$ will always contain a linear term in l so that the linear term in k of $\Omega_{k,0}$ will always be present. The evaluation of the explicit k dependence of $\Omega_{k,0}(n)$ is complicated by the dependence introduced by $P_{k,l}(q,n)$ which is difficult to analyse. The scaling property of $P_{k,l}(q,n)$, equation (28), allows however to draw conclusion on the dependence on n of $\Omega_{k,0}(n)$. These conclusions will be further confirmed by an Hartree approximation for $\nu = 1$ that will also give some indication on the k dependence of the dispersion relation.

The method is based on the separation of the dependence on l and q of $\epsilon_q - \epsilon_{q+l}$. If $\epsilon_q - \epsilon_{q+l} = \alpha(l)\beta(q)$ then $\gamma_{k,l}(n) = \alpha(l)\eta_{k,l}(n)$ where $\eta_{k,l}(n) = \sum_q P_{k,l}(q,n)\beta(q)$. The dependence on n of $\eta_{k,l}(n)$ can be extracted using equation (28), i.e.

$$\eta_{k,l}(n) = \int dx \mu_{k,l}(x)\beta(nx). \tag{30}$$

In the case of a finite range potential of the form $\epsilon_q = e^{-q/q_o}$ we may take $\alpha(l) = 1 - e^{-l/q_0}$ and $\beta(q) = e^{-q/q_o}$ that in equation (30) means that the behaviour of $\eta_{k,l}(n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ is related to the behaviour of $\mu_{k,l}(x)$ as $x \rightarrow 0$ as could be expected since only pairs with small RAM contribute to the energy. Also note that for $l \simeq k/2 \propto \sqrt{n}$ all the dependence on k and n is in $\eta_{k,l}(n)$ since $\alpha(k/2) \simeq 1$. However the analysis of $\mu_{k,l}(x)$ as $x \rightarrow 0$ is a very difficult task. We will circumvent this difficulty introducing the Hartree approximation in the following. A point worth of mention here is that the behaviour in n of $\Omega_{k,0}(n)$ for short range potentials depends on the properties of the ground state, i.e. on $\mu_{k,l}(x)$. No assumption on the form of $\mu_{k,l}(x)$ is instead necessary to extract the n dependence of $\Omega_{k,0}(n)$ in the case of a long range potential of the form $\epsilon_q = q^{-a}$ (here $a = 1/2$ would correspond to the Coulomb potential). The separation of the l dependence from the q dependence is possible in this case using power expansion. The term l^m will have a coefficient $\beta_m(q) \propto q^{-a-m}$ that in equation (30) will give a term of the order of n^{-a-m}. In the thermodynamic limit the $m = 1$ term is dominant and all the others can be neglected even when $l \propto \sqrt{n}$. The situation is then very similar to that of the harmonic potential since $\epsilon_q - \epsilon_{q+l}$ can be replaced by $l \sum_q P_{k,l}(q,n) a q^{-a-1}$. The resulting spectrum $\Omega_{k,0}$ will be linear in k in a first approximation. However, due to the additional dependence on l and k introduced by $P_{k,l}(q,n)$, the EW frequency could contain also higher powers of k. The coefficient of the linear term in $\Omega_{k,0}(n)$ will be of the order of n^{-a} that in equation (29) yields a sound velocity $c \sim n^{1/2-a}$ that vanishes for $a > 1/2$. In real space this means that for potential vanishing faster than $1/r$, that is faster than the Coulomb potential, the contribution of the interaction energy to the EW velocity is zero.

Let us now turn to the Hartree approximation to the EW frequency. The derivation of this approximation is presented in the appendix. Here we briefly comment on its nature before turning to the discussion of the results. The final formula can also be obtained from equation (22) by replacing the pair of operators $f^{+}_{T+k}(q+l)f_T(q)$ with their commutator that has a form similar to S^{+}_{k} (see (15)) of a density excitation. The justification for this is that the neglected term, $f_T(q)f^{+}_{T+k}(q+l)$, tries to create pairs with TAM $T+k$ on the filled Landau level and this is of course not possible if $T+k \leq 2(n-1)$. Since the terms with $T > 2(n-1)$ of equation (22) vanish on the $\nu = 1$ state (since $f_T(q)|\psi_0(n)\rangle \equiv 0$) the neglected exchange term acts only on the "Fermi surface". Apart from this, the derivation also makes use of equation (9) and then the condition $q \ll n$ is assumed. The final result reads

$$\Omega^{H}_{k}(n) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{j} \sum_{q} \epsilon_q \Gamma^{(j)}(q/n) \tag{31}$$

The first two terms $j = 1$ and 2 terms were worked out explicitly and their expansion in powers of $\sqrt{q/n}$ were found to contain only odd powers. The dependence on q through the ratio q/n stresses once again that edge wave excitations involve pairs of RAM of order n. Note that, for $k \propto \sqrt{n}$, the linear term in k dominates on all the others and this suggests that the asymptotic spectrum is linear. This means that the harmonic approximation for the Hartree potential is a good one[18].

Since $\Gamma^{(1)}(y) \propto \sqrt{y} + O(y^{3/2})$, it is straightforward that for a finite range potential $\Omega^{H}_{k}(n) \sim kn^{-3/2}$. This result coincides with the power law behaviour found by Stone et.al.[8] numerically. If combined with equation (30), it suggests that $\mu_{k,l}(x) \sim x^{3/2}$ for $x \ll 1$. Note that for a short range interaction also the possibility of a finite dispersion relation with a long wavelength behaviour of the type $(k/\sqrt{n})^3$ is ruled out by equation (31). The above mentioned results for a long range potential are nicely recovered together with the numerical result[8] $\Omega_k(n) \sim kn^{-1/2}$ for the Coulomb potential. Moreover equation (31) provides a further indication for the asymptotic linearity of the dispersion relation for long range potentials. Finally the coefficient of the k^2 term, that removes the degeneration of the linear term, were found to be positive so that, as conjectured by Stone et al.[8], the ground state in the sector $L = L_o + M$ is actually $S^+_M|\psi_0(n)\rangle$.

In summary it has been shown that for monotonic potentials edge wave excitations near $\nu = 1$ are free bosons as $n \to \infty$. The creation operators of edge excitations are S^+_k. This result is in some sense a consequence of the completeness of the basis set created by S^+_k. Every operator that raises the total angular momentum of the system can be expressed as a sum of combinations of S^+_k. This has been explicitly done for the commutator $[\hat{H}, S^+_k]$ which turn out to have a dominant contribution, as $n \to \infty$, proportional to S^+_k.

The behaviour of the EW spectrum has been discussed for general classes of potentials. In particular the long wavelength limit, that is related to the $n \to \infty$ limit for $k \sim \sqrt{n}$, has been explored in a general way using the fact that pairs with a RAM of order n are involved in edge excitations. This statement, that refers to the difference in the RAM distribution of the excited state with respect to that of the ground state, is also displayed in the results of the Hartree approximation, where again the dependence on the RAM q comes through the ratio q/n. The fact that macroscopic quantum numbers are involved in edge excitations supports the validity of the classical hydrodynamical picture[9]. The special role played by the harmonic $\epsilon_q = -\gamma q$ interaction and the result, from the Hartree approximation, that the asymptotic dispersion is linear in k, is also reminiscent of a classical elastic response. In some sense this potential comes out naturally in dealing with edge excitations for any pair interaction ϵ_q; the effective $\gamma(n)$ being some average of $\partial_q \epsilon_q$. The reason why this comes out is essentially the same for which the single particle confining potential, coming from Coulomb interaction with nuclei, is usually modeled by a harmonic one[13,15,16,19,18].

A final consideration concerns the extension of these results to $\nu = 1/m$. Note that equation (24) for the potential $\epsilon_q = -\gamma q$ is an exact result for any ν. This formula, as equation (26), is a statement about operators.

There are two basic conditions on the ground state $|\psi_0(n)\rangle$ that have been used:

i) S_k^+ provide an orthonormal basis of the Hilbert space for $L = L_o + M$. The overlap between different states $\langle j_1, \ldots, j_m | k_1, \ldots, k_p \rangle$ vanishes as n^{-1}.

ii) S_k^- annihilate the ground state for any k: $S_k^- |\psi_0(n)\rangle \equiv 0$.

If these two conditions are satisfied also by the Laughlin state then the whole description of EW presented for $\nu = 1$ can be applied at $\nu = 1/m$. Actually if condition **i)** holds, the second one follows by a simple argument. This is because if it were not so also S_k^- would provide low lying excitations so that the ground state energy would not have a cusp at $\nu = 1/m$. Evidences for the validity of condition **i)** for $\nu = 1/m$ come from the parton construction of the Laughlin states[2,9,12] and also from the result $\left[\hat{H}, S_k^+\right] = 0$ for the HC interaction. These strongly suggest that the same picture outlined for $\nu = 1$ holds for $\nu = 1/m$. This supports the idea[19] that edge states at $\nu = 1/m$ are in a 1 to 1 correspondence to edge states at $\nu = 1$. Another consequence of this is that, while the asymptotic behaviour of the EW spectrum is expected to change for finite range potentials, as it does change for the HC potential, going from $\nu = 1$ to $\nu = 1/m$ (here $\Omega_k \equiv 0$), the same behaviour is expected for long range potentials. This is because the power law behaviour of $\Omega_{k,0}(n)$ on n depends explicitly on the structure of the ground state only in the former case. The conclusion that the Coulomb interaction gives contribution to the EW velocity while potentials vanishing faster as $r \to \infty$ do not, can then be extended to $\nu = 1/m$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank E.Tosatti for frequent discussions and for proof reading of the manuscript. I am also grateful to M.Bernasconi and G.Baskaran for very interesting discussions and to

M.D.Johnson for drawing my attention to ref.[8], for valuable discussions and for a stimulating correspondence.

APPENDIX: THE HARTREE APPROXIMATION

The pair interaction hamiltonian can be approximated by a single particle potential for $\nu = 1$ using $f_T^+(q) f_T(q) = f_T(q) f_T^+(q) - \left[f_T(q), f_T^+(q) \right]$. If only the part of $f_T^+(q) f_T(q)$ acting on the lowest $n-1$ orbitals is considered the first term can be neglected. The hamiltonian then becomes $\hat{V}^H = \sum_{u<n} e_u(n) c_u^+ c_u$ where the energy of the orbital u is given by

$$e_u(n) = \sum_{T,q} \epsilon_q 2 b_T^2(u,q)$$

the sums on T and q run on all the values consistent with $u < n$ and $T - u < n$ for the above mentioned restriction. This single particle potential yields indeed the exact value (16) of the $\nu = 1$ interaction energy. The commutator with S_k^+ is easily carried out with the result

$$\left[\hat{V}^H, S_k^+ \right] = - \sum_m \left[e_m(n) - e_{m+k}(n) \right] \sqrt{\frac{(m+k)!}{m!}} c_{m+k}^+ c_m .$$

This can be approximated by $-\Omega_k^H(n) S_k^+$ by taking out of the sum the value of $e_m(n) - e_{m+k}(n)$ for $m = n-1$ on the "Fermi surface". In other words $\Omega_k^H(n)$ is the gain in energy if one electron on the outer orbital is raised by k units of angular momentum. The result can be cast in the form $\Omega_k^H(n) = \sum_q \epsilon_q \Gamma_k(q,n)$ where

$$\Gamma_k(q,n) = 2 \sum_{T=q}^{2(n-1)} \left[b_T^2(n-1,q) - b_{T+k}^2(n-1+k,q) \right] .$$

This expression can be evaluated using the variable $x = (n - 1 - T/2)/\sqrt{T/2}$ and the asymptotic form of $b_T(u,q)$ equation (9). The sum on T can be changed into an integral in dx whose upper limit can be taken to by ∞ for $q \ll T \propto n$ (this is also the condition for the validity of (9)). After some algebra $\Gamma_k(q,n)$ takes the form

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}} \int_0^\infty J(y) \left[\phi_q^2(\sqrt{n} y) - A(y,g) \phi_q^2 \left(\sqrt{n} C(y,g) \right) \right] dy$$

where $J(y)dy$, $A(y,g)$ and $C(y,g)$ are the expressions of $\sqrt{2/(nT)}dT$, $\sqrt{T/(T+k)}$ and $(n-1+k/2-T/2)/\sqrt{n(T+k)/2}$ respectively in the variables $y = x/\sqrt{n}$ and $g = k/n$. Note that $A(y,0) = 1$ and $C(y,0) = y$. Next the integrand is expanded in powers of g and the terms containing derivatives of $\phi_q^2(x)$ are integrated by parts. The final result is equation (31) where

$$\Gamma^{(j)}(q/n) = \int_0^\infty F_j\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\phi_q^2(x)dx.$$

The dependence on q/n of the above expression comes from the fact that $\phi_q^2(x)$ falls off rapidly for $x > \sqrt{q}$. The cases $j = 1$ and 2 were worked out explicitly with the result $F_1(y) = y - \frac{3}{8}y^3 + \frac{15}{128}y^5 - \frac{35}{1024}y^7 + \ldots$ and $F_2(y) = \frac{3}{4}y - \frac{15}{32}y^3 + \frac{105}{1024}y^5 - \frac{315}{4096}y^7 + \ldots$.

REFERENCES

[1] T.Chakraborty and P.Pietilainen, *The Fractional Quantum Hall Effect*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1988). R.Prange and S.Girving, *The Quantum Hall Effect*, Springer-Verlag, New York (1989).

[2] J.K.Jain: *Phys.Rev.* **B 41**, 7653 (1991).

[3] R.B.Laughlin: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **50**, 1395 (1983).

[4] R.B.Laughlin: *Phys.Rev.* **B 27**, 3383 (1983).

[5] F.D.M.Haldane: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **51**, 605 (1983).

[6] S.A.Trugman and S.Kivelson: *Phys.Rev.* **B 31**, 5280 (1985).

[7] A.H.MacDonald, H.Akera and M.R.Norman: *Phys.Rev.* **B 45**, 10147 (1992).

[8] M.Stone, H.W.Wyld and R.L.Schult: *Phys.Rev.* **B 45**, 14156 (1992).

[9] X.G.Wen: *Int.J.Mod.Phys* **B 6**, 1711 (1992).

[10] S.M.Girvin and T.Jach: *Phys.Rev.* **B 28**, 4506 (1983).

[11] D.Yoshioka: *Phys.Rev.* **B 29**, 6833 (1984).

[12] M.Stone: *Phys.Rev.* **B 42**, 8399 (1990).

[13] A.H.MacDonald, S.-R.Eric Yang and M.D.Johnson, *Australian Journal of Physics*, to appear (1993).

[14] Here we have disregarded a term involving the sum over the first k states of the LLL which is negligible.

[15] N.F.Johnson and M.C.Payne, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **67**, 1157 (1991); N.F.Johnson, *Phys.Rev.* **B 46**, 2636 (1992).

[16] B.L.Johnson and G.Kirsczenow, *Phys.Rev.* **B 47**, 10563 (1992).

[17] The function $P_{k,l}(q,n)$ has a complex expression that depends not only on $N_T(q)$ but on the full "pair density matrix" $G_T(q,p) = \langle\psi_0(n)|f_T^+(q)f_T(p)|\psi_o(n)\rangle$.

[18] The commutator of a single particle potential $\hat{V}_1 = \sum_m E_m c_m^+ c_m$ with S_k^+ yields ckS_k^+ only if $E_m = cm$ that is for a harmonic potential. For a general potential the commutator is very close to S_k^+ under the same assumptions of monotonicity and smoothness discussed in the text for ϵ_q. An effective harmonic potential can be defined for $\nu = 1$ with $c(n) \simeq partial_m E_m|_{m=n-1}$.

[19] See A.H.MacDonald and M.D.Johnson, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **70**, 3107 (1993) and references therein.

FIGURES

FIG. 1. Plot of the distribution of relative angular momentum, $N(q) = \sum_T N_T(q)$, for a 6 fermion system at effective filling 1/3. L_{tot} is the total angular momentum, m_{max} is the highest Landau orbital considered. Lines are drawn only for guiding eyes. The full dots (●) refers to the exact ground state, open dots (○) to the $m = 3$ Laughlin state while the squares (□) refers to the state built with three pair creation operators of highest relative angular momentum.

FIG. 2. Plot of the distributions $\mu_{k,l}(q/n) = nP_{k,l}(q,n)$ for $n = 30, 40$, $k = 8$ and all even values $l = 2, 4, 6$ and 8.

TABLES

k	$\langle k\vert\psi_o^c\rangle$	$\langle k\vert\psi_o^h\rangle$	$\langle k\vert\psi_o^x\rangle$
2	0.9995	0.9995	0.9995
3	0.9967	0.9967	0.9967
4	0.9896	0.9905	0.9885
5	0.9758	0.9795	0.9611
6	0.9525	0.9624	0.6077
7	0.9168	0.9379	0.0275
7	-	-	0.9718

TABLE I. Overlap between the state $\langle k|$ and the ground states of the Coulomb ($|\psi_o^c\rangle$), of the hard core ($|\psi_o^h\rangle$) and of the potential ϵ_q^x ($|\psi_o^x\rangle$) defined in the text. In the last line $|\psi_o^x\rangle$ is the first excited state of the latter potential for $k = 7$.